DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 058 TM 830 407

AUTHOR	Weber, Larry J.; McBee, Janice K.
TITLE	Evaluation of Public Fundamental Schools in Hampton, Virginia.
INSTITUTION	Hampton City School Board, Va.
PUB DATE	Aug 82
NOTE	66p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, Montreal, Quebec, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Classroom Environment; *Comparative Analysis; *Educational Environment; Elementary Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Junior High Schools; *Nontraditional Education; Parent Attitudes; Public Schools; School Districts; *Self Concept Measures; Surveys; Traditional Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Fundamental Schools

ABSTRACT

Findings are presented which provide information about the extent to which fundamental schools (learning in a highly structured setting with instructional emphasis placed on "basic" subjects) at the elementary and junior high school levels in a large school system in Virginia have achieved their objectives. In this report, four schools from the Hampton City Public School system were designated as fundamental schools, three at the elementary level and one at the junior high level. Comparative data were examined for both fundamental and traditional schools. Traditional schools whose demographic characteristics were similar to those of fundamental schools were selected. Statistical methods were those designed to equate groups (e.g., covariance and correlated t-tests). Achievements of the schools were evaluated and discussed in four areas: (1) educational achievement of students, (2) school and classroom learning and behavioral climates, (3) self-concept, and (4) a parents' survey. Students in the fundamental schools performed as well or better on almost all of the comparisons made. The authors felt that their results would not dissuade fundamental school advocates from their strong stance for continuing or expanding the concept in public schools. (The evaluation instruments, the parent survey and the results of the survey are included in the appendix.) (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED234058

EVALUATION OF PUBLIC FUNDAMENTAL SCHOOLS IN HAMPTON, VIRGINIA

A REPORT BY

Larry J. Weber

Janice K. McBee

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. J. Weber

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 830 407

August, 1982

Evaluation of Public Fundamental Schools in Hampton, Virginia

A Report Submitted to
Hampton City Public Schools

By

Larry J. Weber
&
Janice K. McBee

August, 1982

CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	ii
Introduction	1
Findings About Educational Achievement	4
Comparison of SRA Achievement Test Scores	4
Comparison of Comprehensive Examination Scores	9
Findings About School and Classroom Learning and Behavioral Climates	17
School Visiting Teams	17
Discipline as Perceived by Teachers	21
School Suspensions	24
Findings About Self-Concept	26
Findings About Hampton City Parents' Survey	30
Discussion	32
Appendix	37
Notes From the Meeting with the Hampton Concerned Parents	38
School Visiting Team Instrument	41
Teacher Instrument (Discipline Scale)	43
Self-Concept Scale	44
Parents' Survey	46
Eggleston's Summary	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Results of ANCOVA Tests on SRA Achievement Test Data for Fundamental & Traditional Schools - Grade 4	6
2.	Results of ANCOVA Tests on SRA Achievement Test Data for Fundamental & Traditional Schools - Grade 6	7
3.	Results of ANCOVA Tests on SRA Achievement Test Data for Fundamental & Traditional Schools - Grade 8	8
4.	Correlated t-Test Data for Fundamental Schools Grades 4 to 6	10
5.	Correlated t-Test Data for Traditional Schools Grades 4 to 6	11
6.	Correlated t-Test Data for Fundamental Schools Grades 6 to 8	12
7.	Correlated t-Test Data for Traditional Schools Grades 6 to 8	13
8.	Comparison of Common Comprehensive Examination Results for Eaton (Fundamental) and Lindsay (Traditional) Schools	16

9. Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools on Matters Related to Behavioral and Learning Climates in the Schools (Elementary Schools) 19

10. Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools on Matters Related to Behavioral and Learning Climates in the Schools (Junior High Schools) 20

11. Discipline Problems in Schools as Perceived by Teachers (Elementary Schools) 22

12. Discipline Problems in Schools as Perceived by Teachers (Junior High Schools) 23

13. Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools on Student Self-Concept (Elementary Schools) 27

14. Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools on Student Self-Concept (Secondary Schools) 28

Evaluation of Public Fundamental Schools
in Hampton, Virginia

INTRODUCTION

In this report findings are presented which provide information concerning the extent to which selected objectives of fundamental elementary and junior high schools in the Hampton City Virginia School System have been achieved. Fundamental schools were initiated in Hampton at the elementary level four years ago. Currently three elementary and one junior high schools operate under the tenets proposed in their concept. That is, they provide learning in a highly structured setting. Instructional emphasis is placed on "basic" subjects, such as English, math, science and social studies. Instructional and learning styles reflect traditional methods and their organization is "more or less" formal and rigorous.

The concept of the fundamental school plan is one based upon the cooperative agreement between the school's administrators, teachers, parents and students. Parents who send their children to fundamental schools agree, through a written contract, to abide to certain principles deemed necessary for the successful operation of the schools. Students are expected to maintain certain standards of deportment in their educational work and behavior. Teachers, who are personally selected by the schools' administrators, agree to provide instruction according to established codes. Administrators are charged with directing and managing the system. Two elementary schools, Barron and Armstrong,

were placed in operation in the fall of 1978. Two additional schools, Tucker-Capps Elementary and Eaton Junior High were converted to fundamental schools in the fall of 1979.

The implementation of any new curricular program of the magnitude of the fundamental school project requires a systematic and comprehensive evaluation so that decisions regarding its efficacy and efficiency can be made. While selected information concerning objectives about the fundamental school have been collected on formal and informal bases and monitoring of the program has occurred continuously since its inception, no independent evaluation by an impartial outside investigator has been made.

At the meeting with a group of concerned parents, who convened on May 13, 1982 at the School Board Administrative Center, problems thought to be associated with fundamental schools in Hampton were discussed. While a number of specific items idiosyncratic to selected schools were reviewed, several of the issues concerned educational and behavioral problems that were thought to have their roots in the fundamental school policies of the entire system. At the urging of the members of the group, the administration agreed to conduct a more careful evaluation of the fundamental schools so that more information could be brought to bear on the problem. (See the notes from May 13 meeting with Hampton Concerned Parents in the Appendix.)

In accordance with the request of the parents' group, Dr. Joseph Lyles contacted Dr. Larry J. Weber, a Professor of Education at Virginia Tech, and contracted with him to direct an evaluation of the fundamental schools in Hampton. In consultation with one another it was de-

cided that the evaluation should examine the following components of the fundamental school system.

1. Educational Achievements of the Students
2. School and Classroom Learning and Behavioral Climates
3. Student Self-Concept
4. Other items as deemed appropriate

As a part of the study some comparative data for both fundamental and traditional schools[1] were examined. Four traditional schools, whose demographic characteristics reasonably approximated those of the fundamental schools, were selected and information similar to that gathered from fundamental schools was collected. Comparisons were made between the two types of schools using statistical tests where practical. Listed below are schools included in the study.

Elementary Schools

Fundamental Schools	Traditional Schools
Barron	Wythe
Armstrong	Machen
Tucker-Capps	Booker

Junior High Schools

Fundamental Schools	Traditional Schools
Eaton	Lindsay

[1] Traditional schools, loosely defined, are other schools in the system that have not adopted the fundamental philosophy.

FINDINGS ABOUT
EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Comparison of SRA Achievement Test Scores:

Possibly the most important study undertaken in the evaluation was the comparison of achievement test results of students in fundamental and traditional schools.

As a part of the Virginia statewide testing program, all students are administered SRA Achievement Tests in selected grades. Students in the Hampton Schools were tested in grades 4, 6 and 8 in the following areas: reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. In addition, a composite score was recorded for the students.

Data on the tests for the students in the two types of schools were analyzed in two ways. Both took into account individual differences that may have existed between the two groups prior to their undergoing instruction in either the fundamental or traditional schools. One analysis consisted of making comparisons of students' SRA test scores using ANCOVA statistical methods, covarying on STEA or EAS (aptitude) scores. This procedure equalized pre-existing aptitude differences so that both groups were equated at a common ability level. The second analysis used correlated t-test methodology within groups to determine if significant test score gains were made during a two-year period, either from grades 4-6 or from grades 6-8.

Data for the ANCOVA analysis are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3 for grades 4, 6 and 8 respectively. In each of the tables are shown

the unadjusted means and standard deviation for all SRA tests. At the grade 4 level results were significant ($p<.01$) on five of the six tests. Nonsignificant findings existed only for the social studies test. In each case fundamental schools scored higher than traditional ones.

For grade 6, no significant differences existed between the two groups of students, after adjustments were made for existing initial differences between them. However, it can be noted that fundamental school students scored higher in five of the six subtests after adjustments were made.

For grade 8 significant differences were found to exist on four of the six subtests, the composite, reading, math and science categories. They were in favor of fundamental school students.

A few comments should be made regarding the above comparisons.

1. Stanine STEA/EAS (aptitude) scores for the groups were always higher for the fundamental school children. They were

Grade	Fundamental School	Traditional School
4	5.44	4.86
6	5.68	5.14
8	6.16	4.69

2. After adjustments were made for the above differences, fundamental schools scored significantly higher on nine of a possible eighteen comparisons, and had higher scores on seventeen of eighteen comparisons.

TABLE 1

Results of ANCOVA Tests
on
SRA Achievement Test Data
for
Fundamental & Traditional Schools

Grade 4

	Fundamental Schools		Traditional Schools		
Test	Unadjusted $\bar{x}$ (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	Unadjusted $\bar{x}$ (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	Significance[1]
Composite	5.88	1.42	4.89	1.83	**
Reading	5.63	1.61	4.78	1.98	**
Language Arts	6.23	1.48	5.01	1.86	**
Math	5.93	1.55	4.98	1.98	**
Social Science	5.58	1.60	5.00	1.96	---
Science	5.67	1.48	4.78	1.95	**

[1] * indicates $p<.05$

** indicates $p<.01$

TABLE 2

Results of ANCOVA Tests
on
SRA Achievement Test Data
for
Fundamental & Traditional Schools

Grade 6

Test	Fundamental Schools		Traditional Schools		Significance[1]
	Unadjusted $\bar{x}$ (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	Unadjusted $\bar{x}$ (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	
Composite	6.40	1.78	5.73	1.86	---
Reading	6.06	1.85	5.34	1.89	---
Language Arts	6.32	1.82	5.89	1.97	---
Math	6.26	1.76	5.74	1.70	---
Social Science	6.10	1.67	5.73	1.79	---
Science	5.77	1.89	5.50	1.64	---

[1] * indicates $p<.05$

** indicates $p<.01$

TABLE 3

Results of ANCOVA Tests
on
SRA Achievement Test Data
for
Fundamental & Traditional Schools

Grade 8

	Fundamental Schools		Traditional Schools		
Test	Unadjusted $\bar{x}$ (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	Unadjusted $\bar{x}$ (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	Significance[1]
Composite	6.36	1.41	4.81	1.65	*
Reading	6.40	1.41	4.83	1.80	*
Language Arts	5.98	1.61	4.85	1.77	---
Math	6.54	1.50	4.89	1.63	*
Social Science	6.56	1.33	5.34	1.55	---
Science	6.30	1.76	4.68	1.66	*

[1] * indicates $p<.05$

** indicates $p<.01$

3. Because of existing slope differences on the covariates the findings for science at grade 4 and math at grade 6 may have to be regarded with some suspicion.

The findings for the analyses conducted using correlated t-statistics are presented in Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7 . They show whether or not significant gains were made for either fundamental or traditional school students from grades 4 to 6 or grades 6 to 8. For students in fundamental schools a significant gain in math scores was made from grade 4 to 6; for traditional students significant gains were made in four test areas -- composite, language arts, math and science between grades 4 and 6. For students in fundamental schools significant gains were made in three test areas -- composite, math and social science between grades 6 and 8; and for traditional students a significant gain was made on the social science test between grades 6 and 8.

The findings from the analyses using correlated t-test methods lead us to conclude that major differences in achievement between fundamental and traditional schools do not exist. These findings, while not at extreme odds with those of the comparative study described earlier, represent a variation from the generally positive results for fundamental schools which most of the comparative data reported in this evaluation show.

Comparison of Comprehensive Examination Scores:

To illustrate further the extent and nature of differences in academic achievement between fundamental and traditional schools, a compara-

TABLE 4

Correlated t-Test Data
for
Fundamental Schools

Grades 4-6

	Grade 4		Grade 6		
Test	x-Score (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	x-Score (Stanine)	Standard Deviation	Significance[1]
Composite	6.21	1.56	6.40	1.78	---
Reading	6.12	1.62	6.06	1.85	---
Language Arts	6.27	1.59	6.32	1.82	---
Math	5.83	1.74	6.26	1.76	**
Social Science	6.09	1.60	6.10	1.67	---
Science	5.83	1.71	5.77	1.89	---

[1] * indicates $p<.05$

** indicates $p<.01$

TABLE 5

Correlated t-Test Data
for
Traditional Schools

Grades 4-6

Test	Grade 4 x-Score (Stanine)	Grade 4 Standard Deviation	Grade 6 x-Score (Stanine)	Grade 6 Standard Deviation	Significance[1]
Composite	5.46	1.72	5.74	1.78	**
Reading	5.58	1.98	5.34	1.82	---
Language Arts	5.59	1.76	5.91	1.90	*
Math	5.20	1.58	5.76	1.60	**
Social Science	5.51	1.87	5.74	1.71	---
Science	5.12	1.70	5.49	1.63	*

[1] * indicates $p<.05$

** indicates $p<.01$

TABLE 6

Correlated t-Test Data
for
Fundamental Schools

Grades 6-8

Test	Grade 6 x-Score (Stanine)	Grade 6 Standard Deviation	Grade 8 x-Score (Stanine)	Grade 8 Standard Deviation	Significance[1]
Composite	5.96	1.38	6.36	1.41	**
Reading	6.16	1.53	6.40	1.41	---
Language Arts	5.86	1.70	5.98	1.61	---
Math	5.72	1.44	6.54	1.50	**
Social Science	5.80	1.62	6.56	1.33	**
Science	5.92	1.54	6.30	1.76	---

[1] * indicates $p<.05$

** indicates $p<.01$

TABLE 7

Correlated t-Test Data
for
Traditional Schools

Grades 6-8

Test	Grade 6 x-Score (Stanine)	Grade 6 Standard Deviation	Grade 8 x-Score (Stanine)	Grade 8 Standard Deviation	Significance[1]
Composite	4.94	1.80	4.82	1.81	---
Reading	4.82	1.91	4.84	1.94	---
Language Arts	4.98	1.92	4.86	1.92	---
Math	5.02	1.46	4.86	1.81	---
Social Science	4.92	1.80	5.31	1.74	*
Science	4.61	1.85	4.76	1.69	---

[1] * indicates $p<.05$

** indicates $p<.01$

tive study using common examination data was conducted between students in Lindsay and Eaton Junior High Schools. The data analyzed were taken from the Comprehensive Mark Analysis Report for the third school quarter for 1981-82, during which time the Hampton School System administered uniform examinations to all junior high schools.

Criteria used for courses selected for analysis included

a) that courses had to be taken by both Lindsay and Eaton students, and

b) that courses had to have an enrollment of at least 50 students from each school.

Twenty-eight courses were identified on which comparisons were made. The nature of the comparisons were

a) the combined percent of A+B grades earned on the comprehensive examinations, and

b) the percent of F grades earned on the examinations.

Chi-square tests to test for independence between the two types of schools and grade distribution were conducted to determine if significant differences existed. In addition, because significance might result from relatively small percent differences, a minimum absolute difference of ten percentage points between the two schools had to exist before the evaluators would consider the differences to be meaningful.

Findings are reported in Table 8 . Significant differences were found in twenty-four of the twenty-eight comparisons and generally favored Eaton Junior High School. In eighteen courses Eaton had a ten

percent greater proportion of A's + B's on the comprehensive examination than did Lindsay. In twenty-one courses Lindsay had a ten percent or greater proportion of F's than did Eaton. In no instance was Lindsay superior to Eaton, according to the ten percent or greater criterion, on the percent of A's + B's; and in only one case did Eaton have greater than ten percent F's in a course than Lindsay. Our conclusion based on the comprehensive examination criteria is that the students in the fundamental school performed much better than those in the traditional school.

TABLE 8

Comparison of Common Comprehensive
Examination Results for
Eaton (Fundamental) and Lindsay (Traditional) Schools

Course	% A+B		% F		Significance
	Eaton	Lindsay	Eaton	Lindsay	(p<.05)
EN GRAM/COM B	27	33	5	18	Yes
EN AC GR/COM B	72	39	2	6	Yes
EN SH ST WKSHP	26	17	30	46	No
SS W GEOG I	20	27	22	13	Yes
SS US HIST I	18	8	20	52	Yes
SS US HIST IC	59	36	0	14	Yes
SS W CULT IC	14	0	21	53	Yes
SS VA/WRLD 7	23	17	20	32	Yes
SS VA/WRLD 7C	46	52	0	4	Yes
MA GEN MATH 7	25	10	19	50	Yes
MA GEN MATH 7C	37	40	14	14	No
MA MATH 8	30	0	25	82	Yes
MA MATH 8C	10	2	19	75	Yes
MA MATH 9	19	12	32	39	No
MA ALGEBRA I	18	9	26	48	Yes
SC INT L SC 7/2	41	12	7	40	Yes
SC L SCI 7/3	81	65	0	4	Yes
SC INT E SC 8/2	25	0	24	77	Yes
SC E SCI 8/3	45	15	2	27	Yes
SC INT P SC 9/2	14	1	42	84	Yes
SC P SCI 9/3	32	17	10	15	No
HP H&PE 7	22	21	15	36	Yes
HP H&PE 8	36	3	12	66	Yes
HP H&PE 9	40	16	5	31	Yes
HE H/MAKING 1-8	42	10	6	35	Yes
IN MOD IND/TEC	39	23	10	48	Yes
AR ART I/8	58	27	12	47	Yes
MS CON CHOIR 9	74	23	11	37	Yes

FINDINGS ABOUT SCHOOL AND CLASSROOM LEARNING AND BEHAVIORAL CLIMATES

School Visiting Teams:

This section of the evaluation report contains data relevant to school and classroom learning and behavioral climates. Specific information gathered for this section included responses of a visiting evaluation team on matters thought to be associated with proper conduct and efficient functioning of schools; and responses made by teaching faculty in fundamental and traditional schools to a questionnaire concerning disciplinary problems encountered in their respective schools. Copies of both data collection instruments are included in the appendix. In addition to the above, information about suspensions in fundamental and traditional elementary and junior high schools is included in this section.

Two evaluation teams comprised of evaluation consultants, Hampton School System administrators and parents having children in fundamental and traditional elementary and secondary schools were appointed to serve on a team to visit schools and observe selected characteristics. A list of these individuals is given below:

Larry Weber	Evaluation Consultant
Janice McBee	Evaluation Consultant
Gerard Chambers	School Administrator
Bertram Sexton	School Administrator
William Day	Parent
Nancy Williams	Parent
Marion Simmons	Parent
Sallie Ford	Parent

Nancy Moore	Parent
Doris Margulies	Parent
Jean Braxton	Parent
Betty Temko	Parent

Each team visited four schools over a two-day period, one school in the morning and one in the afternoon. After having had the opportunity to observe conditions in the school, they completed an evaluation instrument about the learning and behavioral climates of the school. The results of those ratings are shown in Tables 9 and 10, for elementary and junior high schools respectively.

For the elementary schools significant differences, in favor of the fundamental schools, were observed in four of the five areas, namely learning climate, student/student interaction, student/teacher interaction, and conduct about the building. No significant differences were observed on matters related to buildings and grounds.

There are a couple of observations that should be mentioned about the above findings so that one will not overgeneralize from them. First, while the quality of student/teacher interaction was rated higher in the fundamental schools, a general lack of such behavior in these schools was noted. Research cautions that such conditions "may be" detrimental to learning. A second point is that the lower mean scores of the traditional schools may be due primarily to low scores given to one of them, Wythe Elementary School. Based on this speculation, the evaluators reanalyzed the data and discovered that, if Wythe school was excluded from the analysis, significant differences between the two types of schools, except for conduct about the building, were eliminat-

TABLE 9

Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools
on Matters Related to Behavioral and
Learning Climates in the Schools

(Elementary Schools)

Category	Fundamental School Mean Score*	Traditional School Mean Score*	t-Statistic	Significant Difference ($p<.05$)
Buildings & Grounds	4.6	4.7	.56	No
Learning Climate	4.4	3.8	2.5	Yes
Student/Student Interaction	4.7	3.8	2.57	Yes
Student/Teacher Interaction	4.7	4.0	2.5	Yes
Conduct About the Building	4.6	4.0	2.7	Yes

*Score Range: 1=poor to 5=good

TABLE 10

Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools
on Matters Related to Behavioral and
Learning Climates in the Schools

(Junior High Schools)

Category	Fundamental School Mean Score*	Traditional School Mean Score*	t-Statistic	Significant Difference ($p<.05$)
Buildings & Grounds	5.0	4.0	3.85	Yes
Learning Climate	4.7	4.0	2.12	No
Student/Student Interaction	4.4	4.4	0.0	No
Student/Teacher Interaction	4.8	4.6	.63	No
Conduct About the Building	4.5	4.0	1.47	No

*Score Range: 1=poor to 5=good

ed. Such a finding suggests that problems existing in traditional schools may be unique to a given school and that their solution may be facilitated if attention is focused on specific trouble areas.

The only significant difference observed between the two junior high schools was in category 1, buildings and grounds, and it was in favor of the fundamental school. (See Table 10.) It should be noted that all scores of the fundamental school were higher than those of the traditional schools. However, ratings for both schools could be considered high, since neither school rated below 4.0 (based on a 5.0 scale) in any category.

Discipline as Perceived by Teachers:

Teachers in fundamental and traditional schools rated behaviors they had seen or encountered in their respective schools. Items related to general student deportment, to relationships that students have with their teachers and other students, to the quality of support that parents give to the school's program and to related items thought to have an effect on learning. The findings are presented in Tables 11 and 12 for elementary and junior high schools respectively.

At the elementary level the teachers in the fundamental schools rated their students higher than teachers in traditional schools did. This finding was true for ten of the eleven items on which ratings were obtained. There was one tie score. Statistical tests were conducted and significant differences were determined for eight of the items. Only for articles related to class distraction (i.e. out of class activities and visitors) and for a question about drug abuse were no significant differences found.

TABLE 11

Discipline Problems in Schools
as Perceived by Teachers

(Elementary Schools)

Problem	Fundamental School Mean Score*	Traditional School Mean Score*	t-Statistic	Significant (p<.05)
Inappropriate or Vulgar Language	4.3	3.7	3.36	Yes
Hostile Behavior Toward Teacher	4.5	4.0	2.57	Yes
Verbal Interruption of Teacher	3.5	2.7	3.93	Yes
Disruptive Student Interaction	3.8	3.3	2.74	Yes
Noise Level & Lack of Ability to Stay on Task	4.0	3.2	3.97	Yes
Hostile Behavior Toward Other Students	4.0	3.3	3.26	Yes
Distraction From Instructional Work (Out of class activities)	4.4	3.8	1.00	No
Distraction From Instructional Work (Visitors)	4.3	4.3	.04	No
Lack of Parental Support for Teacher Requests	3.9	3.4	2.23	Yes
Lack of Home Discipline	3.6	3.0	2.69	Yes
Drug Abuse	5.0	4.8	1.00	No

*Range of Scores: 1=Major Problem to 5=Not a Problem

TABLE 12

Discipline Problems in Schools
as Perceived by Teachers

(Junior High Schools)

Problem	Fundamental School Mean Score*	Traditional School Mean Score*	t-Statistic	Significant ($p<.05$)
Inappropriate or Vulgar Language	4.4	2.4	9.09	Yes
Hostile Behavior Toward Teacher	4.7	3.3	7.13	Yes
Verbal Interruption of Teacher	3.9	2.2	7.47	Yes
Disruptive Student Interaction	4.0	2.3	7.13	Yes
Noise Level & Lack of Ability to Stay on Task	4.1	2.3	8.22	Yes
Hostile Behavior Toward Other Students	4.2	2.5	7.96	Yes
Distraction From Instructional Work (Out of class activities)	4.7	4.1	3.58	Yes
Distraction From Instructional Work (Visitors)	4.8	4.0	3.90	Yes
Lack of Parental Support for Teacher Requests	4.6	2.7	10.17	Yes
Lack of Home Discipline	4.3	2.4	9.03	Yes

*Range of Scores: 1-Major Problem to 5=Not a Problem

At the junior high school level data were acquired from teachers on the first ten items. Differences between the fundamental and traditional schools were even more dramatic than those between elementary schools. Findings were significant for all ten items on the questionnaire.

Our conclusions are that teachers perceived the disciplinary climate in fundamental schools to be superior to that of traditional schools in both the elementary and junior high schools.

School Suspensions:

A third characteristic about schools that was investigated concerned the number of suspensions during the school year for elementary and secondary fundamental and traditional schools. Listed below is information pertaining to that part of the study.

Elementary School Suspensions

Fundamental Schools	No. of Suspensions
Barron	3
Armstrong	3
Tucker-Capps	4
Total	10

Traditional Schools	No. of Suspensions
Booker	0
Machen	21
Wythe	0
Total	21

Junior High School Suspensions

Fundamental School	No. of Suspensions
Eaton	59
Traditional School	**No. of Suspensions**
Lindsay	780

At the elementary school level there were more than **two times** the number of suspensions in the traditional schools than in the fundamental schools (21 vs 10). But the numbers are so small that it would be improper to draw conclusions.

At the junior high school level, however, the numbers are substantial (780 vs 59), and the fact that there are over 13 times as many suspensions in the traditional school as in the fundamental school would lead us to conclude that disciplinary problems, which lead to suspensions are much greater in the traditional school than in the fundamental school.

FINDINGS ABOUT SELF-CONCEPT

The image that a student has of him/herself can be an important determinant of whether or not their lives turn out successfully. Most certainly the experiences that students have in their school environment play an important role in shaping and affecting their self image. Accordingly, the evaluators decided that some information about how students viewed themselves, their self-concepts, ought to be collected and analyzed in relation to the type of school they attended.

A twenty-nine item instrument adapted from Bledsoe and Garrison's Self Concept Scale was developed and administered to approximately 300 elementary and secondary school students. A copy of the instrument is included in the appendix materials. On the instrument students rated themselves according to a list of twenty-nine positive and negative items which described personal qualities. Reliability estimates were obtained on two subsamples of students, N=161 and N=103 respectively. Using Kuder-Richardson procedures, their respective coefficients were .86 and .88.

Mean scores for all students were obtained by summing across items and dividing by the total number of items. Results are shown in Tables 13 and 14 for elementary and junior high school students. The findings for both groups were non-significant (t=.62 for elementary school students and t=.17 for junior high school students). Based on those findings we concluded that no difference in self-concept existed between the fundamental and traditional students.

In addition to statistical tests conducted on total group scores chi-square statistics were computed on the twenty-nine individual scale

TABLE 13

Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools on Student Self-Concept

(Elementary Schools)

	Fundamental School Score	Traditional School Score
Mean Score*	40.3	41.1
Standard Deviation	7.2	9.3

t-Statistic = .62 (not significant)

*Score Range: 29=good to 87=poor

TABLE 14

Comparison of Fundamental and Traditional Schools on Student Self-Concept

(Secondary Schools)

	Fundamental School Score	Traditional School Score
Mean Score*	44.2	44.4
Standard Deviation	8.1	6.9

t-Statistic = .17 (not significant)

*Score Range: 29=good to 87=poor

items for both types of schools at both grade levels. Significant differences were found at the elementary level on the "friendly", "mean", and "bad" items. All results were in favor of fundamental school students. At the junior high level, differences were also found on three scales. Two scales ("lazy" and "bad") favored traditional students and one ("kind") fundamental students. Our interpretation is that the results are not meaningful because chance factors could account for about half of the differences found. So we are inclined to sustain our earlier conclusion of no marked self-concept differences between fundamental and traditional students at either the elementary or junior high school levels.

FINDINGS ABOUT HAMPTON CITY PARENTS' SURVEY

A survey of parents having children in Hampton City Schools was conducted in July of 1982. One hundred thirty-one useable forms, of which 21% represented parents of children in fundamental schools, were returned to the School Board Office. A copy of the survey form and a tally of responses are included among the appendix materials.

The purposes of the survey were 1) to determine the attitudes that parents have toward the fundamental schools in the system, 2) to determine the impact that fundamental schools are having on the educational enterprise in the Hampton system, and 3) to obtain some clues about whether fundamental schools represent a viable alternative for school age children in the area.

Findings from the parental survey were highly favorable toward fundamental schools and are presented in summary format below.

1. 81% of the parents having children in fundamental schools rated the educational programs of the schools as superior. This figure can be compared to a 9% rating of parents whose children attend traditional schools.
2. 73% of the parents who have children in traditional schools said they wanted their child transferred to a fundamental school and, of that group, 68% indicated they would be willing to provide transportation to fundamental schools out of their neighborhood areas.
3. While 62% of the parents believed that fundamental schools had had a positive impact on the city-wide school programs, 32% of the parents with children in traditional schools believe that

their own schools are less desirable because of them. This latter figure (32%) can be compared to the 11% figure of parents with children in traditional schools who think their own schools are better because of fundamental schools.

4. Parents apparently like the discipline and academic standard requirements of fundamental schools. They believe that the Hampton School System should afford the same educational opportunity for all and that those children who do not comply with reasonable academic and conduct requirements should be placed in an alternative setting.

In addition to the recently conducted parent survey, results of data analyzed in 1980 by Charles Eggleston tended to show that fundamental schools were meeting the wishes of parents better than traditional ones. Items which support this conclusion related to academic and discipline facets of schools and the more favorable attitude toward schools expressed by parents having children in fundamental schools. A copy of Eggleston's summary data is included in the appendix.

DISCUSSION

This evaluation was conducted to determine the progress fundamental schools are making in achieving their objectives. Information concerning the cognitive achievement of students, school and classroom learning climates, discipline, student self-concept and other relevant outcomes of schools was gathered. Where possible, comparisons between students in fundamental and traditional schools were made and statistical tests were conducted to determine if significant differences existed. Attempts to control for underlying differences between the two groups of students by selecting schools with similar demographic characteristics and by appropriate statistical procedures were made.

We would be remiss if we attributed the positive results, favoring students in fundamental schools, solely to their being enrolled in schools with that philosophy. However, the fact remains that they did perform as well or better on almost all of the comparisons made. Our findings certainly will not dissuade fundamental school advocates from their strong stance for continuing or expanding the fundamental school concept in the Hampton School System.

On cognitive outcomes, fundamental school students achieved as well or better than students in traditional schools, after controls for initial differences between students had been made. While it was not possible to exercise such controls when making comparisons on common examination data, the overwhelming superiority of fundamental school students in attaining better grades cannot be discounted. They not only made higher grades, they also failed less in a great many more courses than might be reasonably expected.

Fundamental school students did better on matters thought to be important for effective and efficient learning, such as classroom learning climates, discipline, and suspensions. While additional comment will be made later on this matter, the goals of fundamental schools regarding such factors apparently are being achieved.

Finally, it appears that the self-concept of students in fundamental schools, as measured by one instrument, is akin to that of students in other schools. This finding is deemed important since the image that children have of themselves ought not to be negatively affected by their educational environment.

Whatever "truth" was uncovered in this evaluation, it should be said that more questions have arisen as a result of the study than were answered. While our primary purpose was to gather data about the efficacy fundamental schools have had in achieving their goals (and our findings suggest that they are), there are other problems associated with the movement that needs to be addressed.

The first is the impact that fundamental schools are having on the traditional schools in the system. This investigation did not attempt to answer that problem. But we suspect that some difficulties in traditional schools which critics attributed to the fundamental school movement may be idiosyncratic to specific traditional schools. Those problems should be addressed directly within the schools. It is questionable that they can be resolved by eliminating fundamental schools.

Another important matter that needs attention is the identification of factors operating in fundamental schools that help them to achieve their objectives. Is it the contract, the homework, the parental involvement,

the teachers, the administration, or the students? Whatever works to bring about success in fundamental schools should be determined because our survey showed that many parents would like to see them in traditional schools, and many parents have expressed dissatisfaction with the educational programs in traditional schools. If the elements which contribute to the success of fundamental schools can be uncovered, they could be incorporated into the programs of other schools.

Another major concern of the evaluators has to do with the underlying philosophy of fundamental schools. The heavy emphasis on basic education leads us to wonder about whether the needs of the "whole child" are receiving attention. This study did not delve into that matter very deeply. What was undertaken, the self-concept study, showed that differences between students in the two schools did not exist and that elementary school students in fundamental schools interacted better with their peers than did students in traditional schools. But the data also suggested a lack of interaction in fundamental schools during classroom time. Research indicates that such interaction may facilitate learning and the general philosophy of the teacher-dominated class may be harmful. It would appear wise to study the matter in greater detail to check on whether our casual observations are valid.

On the matter of discipline on which students in fundamental schools are vastly superior, it is difficult to determine what accounted for the difference we observed. It may be as simple a matter as not tolerating such behavior, and obviously the fundamental schools do not. Possibly the isolation of all the "problem" students in a single environment, the traditional schools, may be responsible for the difference. (The oppo-

site side of that coin may be that the students in fundamental schools have never caused problems and they now reside in a "sterile" environment.)

A final observation on the matter of discipline is that it seems unfair for fundamental schools to have the right to expel children and return them to traditional schools. There ought to be another way for a school to solve its disciplinary problems than to send them to a traditional school.

Another matter that merits study about fundamental schools concerns their impact on the inquiry skills of students. When schools operate under educational conditions established for fundamental schools, it becomes easy for the learning climate to become teacher-dominated. What effect such domination might have toward inhibiting the inquisitive nature and creative expression of students is not known, but such inclinations deserve our attention and observations ought to be made, at least on an informal basis, to guard against tendencies of this type.

Finally, it would appear appropriate to conduct studies about the values that fundamental schools are instilling in its pupils. A first step in such a study obviously calls for the identification of the values. Once that is accomplished, studies can be designed which will provide evidence on the success of fundamental schools on that factor. But it would be interesting to discover the values children have on matters related to citizenship, honesty, traditional morality, tolerance and love of fellow man.

In summary and conclusion, we should say that the evaluators found substantial evidence that the fundamental schools are achieving their ob-

jectives. They did not make a definite determination of the impact that such schools have on the traditional schools in the system. They suspect that both positive and negative effects have occurred as a result of their implementation. Nothing in the evaluation was uncovered which would cause a recommendation for the abandonment of the fundamental school concept at this time, and reasonably strong sympathy was uncovered for the expansion of some of the policies of the fundamental school to other educational settings.

APPENDIX

Hampton City Schools
P O BOX 370
Hampton, Virginia 23669
JOSEPH H. LYLES, Ed. D.
Administrative Assistant

NOTES FROM THE MEETING WITH THE HAMPTON CONCERNED PARENTS - FUNDAMENTAL SCHOOL STUDY on May 13, 1982

A meeting was held in the school board administrative center on Thrusday, May 13, with a group of parents (see attached list) to discuss problems which they perceive to be related to the fundamental schools.

These concerns are summarized in brief form and are listed as presented.

1. There is now a growing amount of pressure by relatively small group of parents to have the school board expand the number of fundamental schools. This pressure now includes a move for a fundamental high school. We believe expansion would be bad; especially to the high schools.

2. Because parents are allowed to register their children for the fundamental schools years ahead of entry age, the schools complete their enrollments before those new to the city have a chance to sign up. The population turn over rate is 38% for the city (according to research by the group). It is especially unfair to the military who must move on short notice..

3. Some of the best students (and parents) are drawn from the regular school to the fundamental school. This leave schools like Wythe with large percentages of low achievers. At Wythe between 75-100 children are at Armstrong.

4. The teachers at the regular schools feel that they must take what is left and too many of the parents of these children don't care. This causes increased problems with discipline.

5. Discipline is more difficult at regular schools because those who break the rules must remain and teachers are forced to work with them. If children break rules at the fundamental school they will be sent back to the regular school. Eaton students have often been told that if they don't obey they will be sent to Lindsay.

HAMPTON-WHERE FREE EDUCATION IN AMERICA BEGAN

6. There is a strong feeling of elitism among fundamental school parents and students. Those who don't get in are hurt, and are made to believe that the education they are getting is not as good. Cases cited where real estate agents tell home buyers that fundamental schools are good and others are not.

7. Regular junior high schools often can't offer all college preparatory classes that Eaton can because so many of their good students are in Eaton. Ex-Spratley does not have advanced science.

8. New students enter Barron only at first of year or semester break. Other schools have students entering and leaving every day. This gives fundamental schools more stability.

9. One of the greatest concerns is of discipline or lack of it at some schools. Here once again fundamental schools have advantage at expense of other schools. Real bad problem children either don't apply for fundamental school; or they are not accepted.
Example - Many students who go to Syms are so intimidated when going to and from school that parents take them to and from school. There are also threats etc. in the building.

10. School division allows fundamental schools to advertise that theyare better - ref. statement in passport, "the fundamental school has an edge on other schools."

11. Why not build up all schools to be equal? - racial balance, curriculum, discipline.

A more careful evaluation of the effects of the fundamental schools is needed. Towards that end, this office will:

1. Carry-out a comparative study of discipline in fundamental schools vs selected other schools.

2. Attempt to evaluate teacher attitudes in fundamental vs regular schools.

3. Analyze test resutls to determine student achievement growth in the fundamental schools vs other.

HAMPTON CONCERNED PARENTS

BILL DAY	WYTHE
DENISE DAY	WYTHE
NANCY MOORE	WYTHE AND LINDSAY
FERN JOHNSON	WYTHE, LINDSAY, AND HAMPTON
KAY DAWSON	ASBURY, SYMS
PAUL BIGELOW	MOTON
CHARLOTTE SMITH	WYTHE, LINDSAY, AND HAMPTON
ANNE GARDNER	LINDSAY AND HAMPTON
BETTY TEMKO	LINDSAY
SUSAN DURBIN	WYTHE
COLLEEN BOYTIN	ASBURY
RACHEL McKNIGHT	LANGLEY

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

Instructions: The purpose of this survey is to document instructional activities, student behavior and other items believed to be associated with the proper conduct and efficient functioning of schools. In each school you visit, please rate the items listed on the questionnaire by circling the number which you believe represents the appropriate value of the item. "1" is the lowest value that can be assigned, "5" is the highest value. If you did not observe a particular item, or if you do not have adequate information to make a judgment, circle the "DNA".

	POOR				GOOD	
I. Buildings and Grounds						
1. The general state of repair of the school is good.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
2. The school is clean and free of litter.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
3. Signs of vandalism and graffiti are minimal.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
4. There are attractive displays in the school and classrooms (bulletin boards, student work).	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
5. Other indicators of respect for and appreciation of property are present.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
II. Learning Climate						
1. Students are working on class assignments.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
2. Students are attentive to directions made by the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
3. Students show interest and enthusiasm for work.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
4. Students are self-directed and exhibit self-discipline.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
5. The class environment and noise level facilitate learning and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA

	POOR				GOOD	
III. Student Interactions with Peers						
1. Students exhibit concern and respect for their classmates.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
2. Differences of opinion are resolved in an orderly fashion.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
3. Aggression and harassment of other students and disorderly conduct are minimal.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
4. Cooperation during learning activities is apparent.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
5. Student behavior during recreational/ social activities is appropriate to the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
IV. Student Interactions with Teachers						
1. Students exhibit respect to the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
2. Students are obedient to the teacher's directions and requests.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
3. Attention-seeking behavior and challenges to the teacher's authority are not present.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
4. Teacher rebuffs of students and corrections for student behavior and misconduct are minimal.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
5. Students exhibit "good manners" toward all adults.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
V. Conduct in Halls, Cafeterias, Playgrounds and about the Building						
1. Cafeteria lines are orderly and the atmosphere is relaxed.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
2. Students show good manners while eating.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
3. Student conduct in the halls is orderly.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
4. Student respect for one another on the school grounds is exhibited.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA
5. Other signs of student behavior about the building indicates good order and discipline.	1	2	3	4	5	DNA

SCHOOL_____

Discipline problems encountered by the respondent -

1=Major problem often observed
2=Problem observed
3=Somewhat of a problem, sometime observed
4=Not much of a problem, very seldom observed
5=Not a problem

Students use inappropriate and/or vulgar language.

1 2 3 4 5

Students are hostile and/or aggressive towards the teacher.

1 2 3 4 5

Students verbally interrupt the teacher.

1 2 3 4 5

Student/student interactions are disruptive.

1 2 3 4 5

There is a general noise created by student movement, activity, or lack of ability to stay on task.

1 2 3 4 5

Students are aggressive and unthoughtful of other students.

1 2 3 4 5

There are too many out-of-class activities/programs that distract instruction.

1 2 3 4 5

There are too many visitors in and out of the classroom.

1 2 3 4 5

Parents fail to respond to requests of teachers, and there is no home back-up when discipline problems occur.

1 2 3 4 5

The children are undisciplined at home and bring the same actions into the school.

1 2 3 4 5

Student use of drugs in the elementary schools is contributing as a breakdown in discipline.

1 2 3 4 5

Directions: Each of us needs to know more about what we are like. This form is to help you describe yourself. There are no right or wrong answers; each person may have different ideas. Answer these according to your feelings. It is important for you to give your own honest answers. Think carefully and check the answer that tells if you are like what the word says: nearly always; about half the time; or just now and then.

THIS IS THE WAY I AM

	nearly always	about half the time	just now and then
Friendly	_____	_____	_____
Obedient	_____	_____	_____
Honest	_____	_____	_____
Thoughtful	_____	_____	_____
Fair	_____	_____	_____
Mean	_____	_____	_____
Lazy	_____	_____	_____
Truthful	_____	_____	_____
Smart	_____	_____	_____
Polite	_____	_____	_____
Clean	_____	_____	_____
Kind	_____	_____	_____
Selfish	_____	_____	_____
Helpful	_____	_____	_____
Good	_____	_____	_____
Cooperative	_____	_____	_____
Cheerful	_____	_____	_____

	nearly always	about half the time	just now and then
Careful	_____	_____	_____
Bad	_____	_____	_____
Studious	_____	_____	_____
Loyal	_____	_____	_____
Likeable	_____	_____	_____
A good sport	_____	_____	_____
Useful	_____	_____	_____
Dependable	_____	_____	_____
Bashful	_____	_____	_____
Happy	_____	_____	_____
Popular	_____	_____	_____
Lawful	_____	_____	_____

Check One:

Boy _____

Girl _____

7/12/82

PARENTAL SURVEY ON HAMPTON CITY FUNDAMENTAL SCHOOLS

1. Do you now have a child in one of Hampton City Schools' Fundamental Schools?

   YES 28 (21%) NO 103 (79%)

2. If you have a child in one of these schools, how would you rate the educational program at the school?

   SUPERIOR 30 (81%) AVERAGE 4 (11%) BELOW AVERAGE 3 (8%)

3. If your child is in a regular school, would you like to have him/her transferred to a fundamental school?

   YES 85 (73%) NO 32 (27%)

4. If yes to question number three, would you be willing to provide transportation for your child to a fundamental school out of your neighborhood area?

   YES 61 (68%) NO 29 (32%)

5. If he/she is in a regular school, how do you rate the educational program at that school?

   SUPERIOR 10 (9%) AVERAGE 81 (64%) BELOW AVERAGE 20 (27%)

6. If your child is in a regular school, how do you believe that this school is affected by the existence of the fundamental schools?

   11 (11%) my school is now better

   56 (57%) my school is unchanged

   32 (32%) my school has been made less desirable

7. What over all effect do you believe that the fundamental schools have on the total city-wide school program?

   79 (62%) improves the program

   35 (27%) has little or no effect on it

   14 (11%) does more harm than good

8. Hampton Schools should afford the same opportunity to all children, and those who do not comply with reasonable academic and conduct requirements should be placed in an alternate setting.

95 (73%) fully agree

31 (23%) agree with reservations

5 (4%) disagree

OTHER _____

_____

9. What feature of the fundamental school do you find most appealing?

86 discipline

67 academic standards

7 selection of students

OTHER _____

_____

10. Are there other types of special schools you would like to have opened in Hampton?

47 School for Arts (Art, Music, Drama, etc.)

27 School for Science

50 School for Gifted

OTHER _____

_____

Hampton City Schools
Administrative Center
P.O. Box 4217
Hampton, Virginia 23664

Joseph H. Lyles, Ed.D.
Administrative Assistant

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TAKEN FROM THE PARENTAL SURVEY
ON HAMPTON CITY FUNDAMENTAL SCHOOLS

Hampton needs an elementary school for children with discipline problems.

Everyone should have the opportunity to attend a fundamental school - you should not have to "wait" on a list.

Children who do not meet conduct requirements should be placed in a separate schools from those who want to learn.

Would like to see a fundamental high school established.

Make the schools safer--particularly the junior high schools, by enforcing discipline.

Felt the attitudes of the teachers and staff in the fundamental schools played an important part in their success.

Unfortunately, certain groups have convinced the academic community to lower standards in discipline and education in order to comply with societies lowering standards. We should not lower our standards. Why not provide an entire school system on the same level as the fundamental schools?

Eggleston's Summary of
Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Schools
1980

Basic Results

The following data was obtained from the tabulation:

Total Results:

Fundamental Schools	Non-Fundamental Schools
1,500 Surveys Distributed	1,500 Surveys Distributed
1,211 Returned	1,102 Returned
1,162 Usable	1,050 Usable

Some forms were determined not to be usable due to lack of responding to all questions and the use of varied comments instead of making a response to the questions.

Question Results:

1. How do you feel about the discipline at your school?

	Fundamental	Non-Fundamental
a. too strict	14	39
b. not strict enough	48	201
c. just about right	1,050	738
d. don't know/no answer	50	72

2. Are you satisfied that your child is being taught basic skills?

a. yes	1,121	947
b. no	41	103

3. Have you attended any lecture, any meeting, or any social occasion in any local school building during the last year?

a. yes	960	648
b. no	202	402

4. Have you ever attended a school board meeting?

a. yes	340	183
b. no	822	867

5. Do you belong to the PTA or a similar group?

	Fundamental	Non-Fundamental
a. Yes	800	587
b. no	362	463

6. If you belong to the PTA or similar group, do you attend meetings regularly during the school year, or not?

a. regular	500	303
b. not regular	662	747

7. Do you feel that today's education is better or worse than when you went to school?

a. better	702	498
b. worse	302	450
c. no opinion	158	102

8. Some people say that if the school and the teachers interest the children in learning, most disciplinary problems disappear. Do you agree or disagree with this?

a. agree	687	490
b. disagree	314	472
c. no opinion	161	88

9. When some children do poorly in school, where would you place the chief blame?

a. children	196	260
b. child's home life	408	320
c. schools	104	193
d. teachers	83	190
e. no opinion/no idea	371	187

10. In recent years has your overall attitude toward your school become more favorable or less favorable?

a. more favorable	818	326
b. less favorable	88	231
c. about the same	208	301
d. no opinion/no idea	48	192

11. Suppose the local public school said they needed much more money. Would you vote to raise taxes for this purpose?

a. for	589	600
b. against	262	347
c. don't know/no opinion	311	103

12. Do you believe private education would serve your child's needs better than public school:

	Fundamental	Non-Fundamental
a. yes	261	437
b. no	801	451
c. No opinion	100	162

13. What is your feeling about homework in regards to your child's amount?

a. too much	110	27
b. adequate	980	723
c. not enough	62	238
d. no opinion	10	62

14. How do you rate your child's attitude about school:

a. Excellent	608	180
b. Good	347	352
c. Fair	160	347
d. Poor	32	161
e. Unsatisfactory	15	10

15. How do you rate your child's academic program?

a. Excellent	420	120
b. Good	631	501
c. Fair	89	410
d. Poor	20	9
e. Unsatisfactory	2	10

16. How do you rate the discipline and student behavior in your school?

a. Excellent	601	100
b. Good	463	421
c. Fair	89	461
d. Poor	7	43
e. Unsatisfactory	2	20

17. How do you rate the school in terms of atmosphere and management?

a. Excellent	620	240
b. Good	482	199
c. Fair	53	558
d. Poor	7	38
e. Unsatisfactory	0	15

18. How do you rate parental involvement in your school?

	Fundamental	Non-fundamental
a. Excellent	292	84
b. Good	650	176
c. Fair	201	566
d. Poor	16	199
e. Unsatisfactory	3	25

19. How do you rate the professional involvement of staff and school in serving you and your child?

a. Excellent	550	156
b. Good	500	447
c. Fair	106	391
d. Poor	6	41
e. Unsatisfactory	0	15

20. In terms of looking at the school totally, what rating would you give your school?

a. Excellent	589	180
b. Good	500	462
c. Fair	73	346
d. Poor	0	47
e. Unsatisfactory	0	15

21. How would you rate your child's progress in terms of responsibility and discipline development?

a. Excellent	306	136
b. Good	603	515
c. Fair	186	361
d. Poor	57	38
e. Unsatisfactory	10	0

Percentages:

In terms of percentages, the following results were tabulated from the total usable questionnaires:

1. How do you feel about the discipline at your school?

a. too strict	.01	.04
b. not strict enough	.04	.19
c. just about right	.90	.70
d. don't know	.04	.07

2. Are you satisfied that your child is being taught basic skills?

	Fundamental	Non-Fundamental
a. yes	.96	.90
b. no	.04	.10

3. Have you attended any lecture, any meeting, or any social occasion in any local school building during the last year?

a. yes	.83	.62
b. no	.17	.38

4. Have you ever attended a school board meeting?

a. yes	.29	.17
b. no	.71	.83

5. Do you belong to the PTA or a similar group?

a. yes	.69	.56
b. no	.31	.44

6. If you belong to the PTA or similar group, do you attend meetings regularly during the school year, or not?

a. regular	.43	.29
b. not regular	.57	.71

7. Do you feel that today's education is better or worse than when you went to school?

a. better	.60	.47
b. worse	.26	.43
c. no opinion	.14	.10

8. Some people say that if the school and the teachers interest the children in learning, most disciplinary problems disappear. Do you agree or disagree with this?

a. agree	.59	.47
b. disagree	.27	.45
c. no opinion	.14	.08

9. When some children do poorly in school, where would you place the chief blame?

	Fundamental	Non-Fundamental
a. children	.17	.25
b. child's home life	.35	.30
c. schools	.09	.18
d. teachers	.07	.18
e. no opinion/no idea	.32	.18

10. In recent years has your overall attitude toward your school become more favorable or less favorable?

a. more favorable	.70	.31
b. less favorable	.08	.22
c. about the same	.18	.29
d. no opinion/no idea	.04	.18

11. Suppose the local public school said they needed much more money. Would you vote to raise taxes for this purpose?

a. for	.51	.57
b. against	.23	.33
c. don't know/no opinion	.27	.10

12. Do you believe private education would serve your child's needs better than public school?

a. yes	.22	.42
b. no	.69	.43
c. no opinion	.09	.15

13. What is your feeling about homework in regards to your child's amount?

a. too much	.09	.03
b. adequate	.84	.69
c. not enough	.05	.23
d. no opinion	.01	.06

14. How do you rate your child's attitude about school?

a. Excellent	.52	.17
b. Good	.30	.34
c. Fair	.14	.33
d. Poor	.03	.15
e. Unsatisfactory	.01	.01

15. How do you rate your child's academic program?

	Fundamental	Non-Fundamental
a. Excellent	.36	.11
b. Good	.54	.48
c. Fair	.08	.39
d. Poor	.02	.01
e. Unsatisfactory	.002	.01

16. How do you rate the discipline and student behavior in your school?

a. Excellent	.52	.10
b. Good	.40	.40
c. Fair	.08	.44
d. Poor	.01	.05
e. Unsatisfactory	.002	.02

17. How do you rate the school in terms of atmosphere and management?

a. Excellent	.53	.23
b. Good	.41	.19
c. Fair	.05	.53
d. Poor	.01	.04
e. Unsatisfactory	.00	.01

18. How do you rate parental involvement in your school?

a. Excellent	.25	.08
b. Good	.56	.17
c. Fair	.17	.54
d. Poor	.01	.19
e. Unsatisfactory	.002	.02

19. How do you rate the professional involvement of staff and school in serving you and your child?

a. Excellent	.47	.15
b. Good	.43	.43
c. Fair	.09	.37
d. Poor	.01	.04
e. Unsatisfactory	.00	.01

20. In terms of looking at the school totally, what rating would you give your school?

a.	Excellent	.51	.17
b.	Good	.43	.44
c.	Fair	.06	.33
d.	Poor	.00	.04
e.	Unsatisfactory	.00	.01

21. How would you rate your child's progress in terms of responsibility and discipline development?

a.	Excellent	.26	.13
b.	Good	.52	.49
c.	Fair	.16	.34
d.	Poor	.05	.04
e.	Unsatisfactory	.01	.00

Statistics:

The chi square and coefficiency of contingency are presented by individual question along with difference. Developed statistics are also shown. Appendix E will show, by question number, the tabulations that were required to obtain the results.

1. How do you feel about the discipline at your school?

Observed Frequency (Fo):

	Too Strict (A)	Not Strict Enough (B)	Just About Right (C)	Don't Know/ No Answer (D)	Total
Fund.	14	48	1050	50	1162
Non-Fund.	39	201	738	72	1050
Total	53	249	1788	122	2212

Expected Frequency (Fe):

Fund.	27.84	130.80	939.27	64.09
Non-Fund.	25.16	118.20	848.73	57.91

PARENT SURVEY

Dear Parent,

Below is a survey that is of interest and importance to your school in determining your opinions and attitudes toward the quality of education your school and school system is providing.

Please note the rating system and respond by circling the appropriate response or rating. This survey can be mailed or brought back to school by students, but it must be returned by Friday, February 13, 1981. In all cases, the survey will be handled in a confidential manner and we encourage your responses.

SURVEY AREA I

1. How do you feel about the discipline at your school?

   a. too strict
   b. not strict enough
   c. just about right
   d. don't know/no answer

2. Are you satisfied that your child is being taught basic skills?

   a. yes
   b. no

3. Have you attended any lecture, any meeting, or any social occasion in any local school building during the last year?

   a. yes
   b. no

4. Have you ever attended a school board meeting?

   a. yes
   b. no

5. Do you belong to the PTA or a similar group?

   a. yes
   b. no

6. If you belong to the PTA or similar group, do you attend meetings regularly during the school year, or not?

   a. regular
   b. not regular

7. Do you feel that today's education is better or worse than when you went to school?

   a. better
   b. worse
   c. no opinion

8. Some people say that if the school and the teachers interest the children in learning, most disciplinary problems disappear. Do you agree or disagree with this?

   a. agree
   b. disagree
   c. no opinion

9. When some children do poorly in school, where would you place the chief blame?

   a. children
   b. child's home life
   c. schools
   d. teachers
   e. no opinion/no idea

10. In recent years has your overall attitude toward your school become more favorable or less favorable?

   a. more favorable
   b. less favorable
   c. about the same
   d. no opinion/no idea

11. Suppose the local public school said they needed much more money. Would you vote to raise taxes for this purpose?

   a. for
   b. against
   c. don't know/no opinion

12. Do you believe private education would serve your child's needs better than public school?

   a. yes
   b. no
   c. no opinion

PARENT SURVEY

13. What is your feeling about homework in regards to your child's amount?

    a. too much
    b. adequate
    c. not enough
    d. no opinion

SURVEY AREA II

Please note this area has a rating scale as follows:
(Please circle one response only)

A	B	C	D	F
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unsatisfactory

14. How do you rate your child's attitude about school?
    A B C D F

15. How do you rate your child's academic program?
    A B C D F

16. How do you rate the discipline and student behavior in your school?
    A B C D F

17. How do you rate the school in terms of atmosphere and management?
    A B C D F

18. How do you rate parental involvement in your school?
    A B C D F

19. How do you rate the professional involvement of staff and school in serving you and your child?
    A B C D F

20. In terms of looking at the school totally, what rating would you give your school?

21. How would you rate your child's progress in terms of responsibility and discipline development?
    A B C D F